



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,853	06/20/2003	Thomas Lich	10191/3107	8481

26646 7590 06/29/2004

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

BEAULIEU, YONEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3661

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/600,853

Applicant(s)

LICH ET AL.

Examiner

Yonel Beaulieu

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to label the boxes in figs. 1 and 2 as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stride (US 6,212,456 B1).

Regarding claims 1 and 3, Stride teaches a system for triggering at least one restraining device comprising at least one (pre-crash) impact sensor and at least one pedestrian-impact sensor for transmitting respective signal (note item 4; col. 1: 6 – 10) and a processor (14) for receiving the signals and adapted to

Art Unit: 3661

trigger the at least one restraining device as a function of the signals (col. 1: 28 – 35; summary; col. 3: 62 – col. 4: 14 at least).

Regarding claim 2, the processor (14) determines a crash type and crash severity for triggering device 16 (see figs. 5A – 5C; col. 3: 65 – col. 4: 14 at least).

Regarding claim 4, Stride teaches the pedestrian-impact sensor being situated in a front bumper of a vehicle (col. 3: 27 – 47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stride ('456) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Breed (US 6,749,218 B2).

As discussed above, Stride teaches all of the limitations except for the impact sensor situated in a rear bumper of a vehicle.

Art Unit: 3661

However, Breed teaches, in the same field of endeavor of triggering a restraining device, a pedestrian-impact sensor situated in a rear bumper of vehicle (abstract; figs. 14A – 16B; col. 20: 44 – 67 at least).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Stride's system by including a pedestrian-impact sensor situated in a rear bumper of vehicle as evidenced by Breed in order to enhance system's safety.

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stride ('456) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Stierle et al. (US 6,513,831 B2).

As discussed above, Stride teaches all of the limitations of claim 1 except for the system configuring the sensor as a side-impact sensor including a peripheral sensor.

However, Stierle et al. teaches, in the same field of endeavor of a system triggering at least one restraining device, configuring the system's sensor as a side-impact sensor including a peripheral sensor (col. 2: 32 – 52 at least).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Stride's teaching by including a side-impact

Art Unit: 3661

sensor including a peripheral sensor as evidenced by Stierle et al. in order to enhance safety of the system in the event of a crash.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yonel Beaulieu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R, from 0900-1600.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas BLACK can be reached on (703) 305-8233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3661

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Y. BEAULIEU
AU 3661

Y. BEAULIEU
PRIMARY EXAMINER